



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,101	03/06/2002	Mark Hendricks Leymaster	17243-00043	9571
7590	06/02/2005		EXAMINER	
John S. Beulick Armstrong Teasdale LLP Suite 2600 One Metropolitan Sq. St Louis, MO 63102			TRAN, QUOC A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/092,101

Applicant(s)

LEYMASTER ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 20-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 12-19 and 33-46 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/08/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: amendment filed 11 March 2005 with recognition of an original filing date of, 6 March 2002.

2. Applicant's election with traverse, Group I (Claims 1-11 and 20-32). The traversal is on the grounds that it should be no undue burden on the Examiner to consider all claims in the single application. In addition Applicant argues that the Examiner has failed to shown claims are independent and distinct.

This is not found persuasive:

The burden is due to the separate searches required because of the different classification indicated in the groupings.

Second the combinations disclosed as usable together in a subcombination or element of combination if they are shown to be separately usable.

Invention (I) has separate utility such as compound document. Independent claim in group I are: 1 and 20.

Invention (II) has separately utility such as structure document. Independent claim in group II is: 12.

Invention (III) has separate utility such as version management. Independent claim in group III are: 33 and 43.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language

4. **Independent claims 1 and 20**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sragner US006272485B1-filed- 18 February 1999 (hereinafter Sragner).

As to independent claim 1, a server having a plurality of templates and other document assembly assets stored therein; and at least one remote computer configured to communicate with said server directing said server to access said plurality of templates and said other assembly assets to assemble fully formatted documents without using any document-assembly software and word processing software stored on said at least one remote computer (as taught by Sragner at col. 2, lines 20-45).

As to independent claim 20, generate a web page displaying a series of questions on said at least one remote computer to be responded to by a user; and fill in a plurality of fill points within an incomplete assembled document stored in said server to complete an assembled document (as taught by Sragner at col. 3, lines 30-50).

5. **Dependent claims 2-11 and 21-32**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sragner US006272485B1-filed- 18 February 1999 (hereinafter Sragner).

As to dependent claim 2, at least one database coupled to said server, each template stored in said database (as taught by Sragner at col. 3, lines 1-10).

As to dependent claim 3, wherein said database comprises at least one security system that limits access to said database to authorized users (as taught by Sragner at col. 5, lines 35-40).

As to dependent claim 4, wherein said at least one remote computer is further configured to communicate with said server to restructure and reassemble a previously assembled document, (as taught by Sragner at col. 4, lines 25-45, Sragner disclosed an server/client interacting filing out form (i.e. template). The schema used here in the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed, wherein interacting filing out form/template is interpretation equivalent to restructure and reassemble a previously assembled document).

As to dependent claim 5, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 4 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale; performing at least one of changing parameters within the previously assembled document, and adding new data to the previously assembled document while reusing organizational elements and document specific data common to the previously assembled document, (as taught by Sragner at col. 3, lines 25-30, Sragner disclosed an server/client interacting filing out form/template, including a provision for updating , remove the available document, manage and rename . The schema used here in the broadest reasonable interpretation

as claimed, wherein updating, remove the available document, manage and rename is interpretation equivalent to changing parameters within the previously assembled document).

As to dependent claim 6, wherein said at least one remote computer is further configured to communicate with said server to assemble documents from an invoked template and said other assembly assets to assure compliance with state and federal laws, rules, and regulations, and business entity rules, regulations, and policies, (as taught by Sragner at col. 3, lines 35-40).

As to dependent claim 7, wherein said at least one remote computer is further configured to communicate with said server to integrate pre-approved documents from another computer system into said assembled document as said documents are being assembled (as taught by Sragner at col. 3, lines 33-40, Sragner disclosed an server/client interacting filing out form/template, wherein user-selected documents including related data and data entry points, from a central server. These embodiments include host sites such as the IRS, government agencies, private corporate hosts providing selectable documents and services from a central server such as tax forms, application forms such grant applications, business and tax forms and reporting forms, and publications such as government reports, books, and instructions).

As to dependent claim 8, wherein said at least one remote computer is further configured to communicate with said server to display a workflow status of said document assembly (as taught by Sragner at col. 3, lines 25-50, Sragner disclosed an server/client interacting filing out form/template, including a security screen to maintain, manage, rename, update and remove the available documents. The schema used here in the broadest reasonable

interpretation as claimed, wherein updating, remove the available document, is interpretation equivalent to a workflow status), **to display at least one of a user identity who created said document assembly** (as taught by Sragner at col. 3, lines 33-40, Sragner disclosed an server/client interacting filing out form/template. It is inherent if the income tax return was filed by one, then identity of one is required to appear in such particular form for individual distinguishing purpose).

As to dependent claim 9, wherein said at least one remote computer is further configured to communicate with said server to display a report including at least one of a summary of all document assembly elements, a summary of missing and incomplete parameters, and a summary of missing and corrupted document assembly elements (as taught by Sragner at col. 3, lines 25-50, Sragner disclosed an server/client interacting filing out form/template, including a security screen to maintain, manage, rename, update and remove the available documents. The schema used here in the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed, wherein updating, remove the available document, is interpretation equivalent to a summary status)

As to dependent claim 10, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 11, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2 and 9 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 21-29 consecutively, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 2-9 and 11 consecutively above, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 30, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 11 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 31, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 32, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 and 10 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wells et al. US006446048B1 filed 03 September 1999

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272- 4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Technology Center 2176

May 28, 2005



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER